MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) 1 United States Attorney 2 MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630) Chief, Criminal Division 3 4 OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CABN 177104) Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 6 Fax: (415) 436-7234 7 E-Mail: owen.martikan@usdoi.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 12 13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. CR 3:12-71210 MAG (LB) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 14 Plaintiff, ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM NOVEMBER 15, 2012 THROUGH 15 NOVEMBER 26, 2012, AND MICHAEL LINDSAY, CONTINUING PRELIMINARY HEARING 16 UNTIL DECEMBER 14, 2012 17 Defendant. 18 19 20 The defendant, MICHAEL LINDSAY, represented by EDWARD HU, and the 21 government, represented by OWEN P. MARTIKAN, Assistant United States Attorney, hereby 22 stipulate and ask the Court to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 23 2012, under the Speedy Trial Act based on continuity of defense counsel, the necessity for 24 defense counsel's effective preparation through review of discovery and due to the government's pending motion for detention. The parties stipulate that, taking into account the exercise of due 25 26 diligence, the ends of justice served by excluding the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, from computation under the Speedy Trial Act outweighed the best interests 27 28 of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

ORDER EXCLUDING TIME & CONTINUING PRELIM.

Case No. CR 3:12-71210 MAG (LB)

1	The parties further stipulate that for the same reasons, good cause exists to continue the		
2	time for preliminary hearing under Fed. Crim P. Rule 5.1 from November 26, 2012, until		
3	December 14, 2012.		
4	SO STIPULATED:		
5	MELINDA HAAG		
6	United States Attorney		
7	/s/		
	DATED: November 15, 2012 OWEN P. MARTIKAN		
8	Assistant United States Attorney		
9			
10	/s/		
11	DATED: November 15, 2012 EDWARD HU		
12	Attorney for Michael Lindsay		
13			
14			
4 -	INDODOCEDI ODDED		
15	[PROPOSED] ORDER		
16	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that		
16 17	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would		
16 17 18	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation		
16 17 18 19	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into		
16 17 18	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time		
16 17 18 19	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into		
16 17 18 19 20	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time		
16 17 18 19 20 21	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The Court also finds		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The Court also finds that this time should be excluded based on the pendency of the government's motion for		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The Court also finds that this time should be excluded based on the pendency of the government's motion for detention.		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between November 15, 2012, and November 26, 2012, would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation through the review of discovery, and would deny the defense continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and that the ends of justice served by excluding this time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The Court also finds that this time should be excluded based on the pendency of the government's motion for detention. The Court further finds, based on the same reasons, that the time for preliminary hearing		

the time for preliminary hearing shall be continued until December 14, 2012. 18 U.S.C. §§

1	3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv); Fed. Crim. P. Rule 5.1.	
2		LIBC
3	DATED: November 26, 2012	
4		HON. LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

28